



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,762	12/27/1999	CARL H. HAUSER	D/99477	9175

7590 12/24/2002
JOHN E. BECK
XEROX CORPORATION
XEROX SQUARE 20A
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2002

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/472,762

Applicant(s)

HAUSER, CARL H. *PH*

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.
2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in the specification, but there are no line number in the claims. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al, U.S. Patent 6,055,540, in view of MacPhail, U.S. Patent 5,107,419.
5. As per claims 1 and 5, Snow et al taught the invention substantially as claimed including a computer-implemented method/computer program product having a computer-readable medium holding computer-executable instructions for performing a method (col.1, lines 35-37,

Art Unit: 2154

col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-6, fig.9, col.12, lines 23-28), for managing documents, comprising

- a. document having a category (col.6, lines 9-18);
- b. determining the document category (col.1, lines 35-39);
- c. receiving at least one processing rule, wherein the rule is associated with the document category (col.1, lines 45-46, col.3, lines 45-67, col.4, lines 1-7); and
- d. processing the document according to the processing rule (col.1, lines 46-58).

6. Snow et al did not specifically teach the method for managing personal documents and loading a document into storage. However, it is obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method to manage personal documents such as personal financial papers. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to first load the electronic documents into storage such as floppy disk or computer hard-drive before sorting them into categories.

MacPhail taught an information handling method that can be implemented in simple personal computer for managing personal documents and loading documents into storage (col.1, lines 30-37, 41-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Snow et al and MacPhail because MacPhail's teaching of implementing Snow et al's computer implemented method/program into simple personal computer enables home users to manage personal documents.

7. As per claim 3, Snow et al taught the invention substantially as claimed including a computer system having a processor, a display and memory, the memory including an operating

Art Unit: 2154

environment, and a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method (col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-6, fig.9, col.12, lines 23-28) of managing documents, comprising

- a. document having a category (col.6, lines 9-18);
- b. Computer-executable instructions for determining the document category (col.1, lines 35-39, col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-3);
- c. Computer-executable instructions for receiving at least one processing rule, wherein the rule is associated with the document category (col.1, lines 45-46, col.3, lines 45-67, col.4, lines 1-7, col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-3); and
- d. Computer-executable instructions for processing the document according to the processing rule (col.1, lines 46-58, col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-3).

8. Snow et al did not specifically teach the system for managing personal documents and to include a computer-executable instruction for loading a document into storage. However, it is obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method to manage personal documents such as personal financial papers. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to first load the electronic documents into storage such as floppy disk or computer hard drive before sorting them into categories using computer-executable instructions programmed in operating systems software such DOS or MicroSoft Windows. MacPhail taught an information handling system using simple personal computer for managing personal documents and loading documents into storage (col.1, lines 30-37, 41-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Snow et

Art Unit: 2154

al and MacPhail because MacPhail's teaching of using simple personal computer for Snow et al's computer system enables home users to manage personal documents using Snow et al's system.

9. As per claim 7, Snow et al taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method for transferring a computer program product from one or more first computers to a second computer connected to the one or more first computers through a communication medium (col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-6, fig.9) comprising:

- a. Accessing, on the one or more first computers, computer-executable instructions, which when executed by a computer (col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-6, fig.9, col.12, lines 23-28), perform the steps of:
 - i. document having a category (col.6, lines 9-18);
 - ii. receiving at least one processing rule, wherein the rule is associated with the document category (col.1, lines 45-46, col.3, lines 45-67, col.4, lines 1-7, col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-3); and
 - iii. processing the document according to the processing rule (col.1, lines 46-58, col.8, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 1-3).

10. Snow et al did not specifically teach the computer-executable instruction to load a document into storage when executed and the system to transfer the computer-executable instructions from the one or more first computers to the second computer through the communications medium. However, it is well known in the art to transfer data files, executable

Art Unit: 2154

programs from one computer to another through a medium. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow users to transfer the computer-executable instruction contained in Snow et al's system from one computer to another through a communication medium for sharing purposes. Furthermore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to first load the electronic documents into storage such as floppy disk or computer hard drive by executing computer-executable instructions programmed in operating systems software such DOS or MicroSoft Windows. MacPhail taught an information handling system having a plurality of workstations connected by a communication link that loads electronic documents into storage (col.4, lines 66-67, col.5, lines 1-16, fig.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Snow et al and MacPhail and load the documents into storage according to the teaching of MacPhail before editing, categorizing, or arranging.

11. As per claims 2, 4, 6 and 8, Snow et al and MacPhail taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 3, 5 and 7. MacPhail further taught the processing rule to include retention criteria for determining how long to save the document (col.1, lines 59-63, col.3, lines 6-9, 19-21, 26-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Snow et al and MacPhail and apply MacPhail's teaching of retention criteria to the documents stored to ensure documents that are no longer needed is automatically deleted.

Art Unit: 2154

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Clements, U.S. Patent 6,182,080, disclosed storing documents into a single file.

Cooper et al, U.S. Patent 5,680,223, disclosed document labeling for storage.

Borrey et al, U.S. Patent 5,159,667, disclosed document identification method.

13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703)305-9678. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:


Official Responses: (703) 746-7239

After Final Responses: (703) 746-7238

Draft Responses: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-5140.

KL
12/18/02


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER